By endeavour, by vigilance, by discipline and self-control, let the wise man make for himself an island which no flood can overwhelm. —*The Dhammapada*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 56 JULY, 1968 NUMBER 9

ONE OF MANY

WE live on the eve of an age in which men will learn to hearken to themselves. Who, or how many, no one is able to know. Yet that it will happen can no longer be concealed. A confluence of forces makes the prediction. Great cracks and seams are opening in the confidence of men in their old beliefs. Strange vapors flow from the fissures, and intoxications sweep up from the streets into the academies, giving even orthodoxies contorted masks. But these, we may think, are the most superficial phenomena of the times, making a flurry of psychological earthquake weather.

The ugliness of history inspires vast distrusts of our own past. Even children wean themselves of faith before they are men and women. To their elders, they seem to look for a free-floating destiny to descend upon them out of the sky, and the reciprocity of generations, the continuity of culture, disappears like an underground river. The brave new young march to their own drums.

Never has genuine longing been mixed with so much froth; never has the resolve to make all things new been coupled with so much frantic outcry. Never have there been so many tremblings in the balance for so many men. Talk of revolution is the cliché of the hour; "must" and "ought" are the most over-burdened words of the time. For centuries there have been quiet places to which men could retreat, but these are hard to find, today. Wealth gives no

escape from modern poisons, and poverty is for some no more than a chosen style of their disgust. The arts make faces at one another and writers worship their nervous systems as though the flickers of tension could release an æsthetic credo. The modern Narcissus tires of his monotonous reflection and stirs the water for fragmenting relief. The roots of a new civilization swell beneath the surface of the earth, and good men fill with feeling but cannot find speech.

The age has had enough of tired Jeremiahs. The prediction of collapse is no novelty, and a surfeit of pessimism becomes its own antidote. Eventually, even doomsayers lose their audience, and if comedy is inappropriate, there have been heroic men who may come again, and whose thoughts precede them. Publishers are reviving Emerson and Thoreau, and people are reading them, with or without scholarly encouragement. They were men who were not borne down by their times, although they saw the worst of them. The times, they said, can change, and men can change them. No disaster could erase this conviction from the minds of men who consulted themselves.

The future, if the world has a future, will be constituted in its beginnings by the thought and action of such men. Theirs is a kind of thinking that can suffer no serious contradiction; and it is thinking which will surely find many renewals in the days to come. Emerson speaks to us today with more truth, if that is possible, than he spoke a century ago:

> If you please to plant yourself on the side of Fate, and say, Fate is all; then we say, a part of Fate is the freedom of man. Forever wells up the impulse of choosing and acting in the soul. Intellect annuls Fate. And though nothing is more disgusting than the crowing about liberty by slaves, which most men are, and the flippant mistaking for freedom of some paper preamble like a "Declaration of Independence," or the statute right to vote, by those who never dared to think or act, yet it is wholesome to man to look not at Fate, but the other way: the practical way is the other. His sound relation to those facts is to use and command, not to cringe to them. "Look not on nature, for her name is fatal," said the oracle. The too much contemplation of these limits induces meanness. . . .
>
> I cite the instinctive and heroic races as proud believers in Destiny. They conspire with it; a loving resignation is with the event. But the dogma makes a different impression, when it is held by the weak and lazy. 'Tis weak and vicious people who

cast the blame on Fate. The right use of Fate is to bring up our conduct to the loftiness of nature.

Who instructed Emerson? Emerson instructed Emerson. What skeins of being united in him to make these utterances ring with more than private conviction? The metaphysics of an explanation we have, but the personal verification is difficult. Yet there is the man, with a courage hardly of this world. He was in the world, and will be, from all accounts, again. Such men are irrepressible:

> But every jet of chaos which threatens to exterminate us, is convertible by intellect into wholesome force. Fate is unpenetrated causes. The water drowns ship and sailor, like a grain of dust. But learn to swim, trim your bark, and the wave which drowned it, will be cloven by it, and carry it, like its own foam, a plume and a power. The cold is inconsiderate of persons, tingles your blood, freezes a man like a dew-drop. But learn to skate, and the ice will give you a graceful, sweet, and poetic motion. The cold will brace your limbs and make you foremost men of time. . . .
>
> A man must thank his defects, and stand in some terror of his talents. A transcendent talent draws so largely on his forces, as to lame him; a defect pays his revenues on the other side. . . . If Fate is ore and quarry, if evil is good in the making, if limitation is power that shall be, if calamities, oppositions, and weights are wings and means,—we are reconciled.

Where did all this come from, for Emerson? Well, we know where it came from. He was a man. And such a man can be opposed only by statistics. Statistics die each year, refuted by events. They are the ephemera of birth, death, and confinement. Emerson knew well enough, it seems, the doctrine, but he wrote out of no labored learning. He wrote out of himself, and we have from him opportunity to confirm the doctrine, which is only the mirror of unfolding life. Who could be downcast in possession of a doctrine which has such illustrations? And he is only one of many.

THEOSOPHICAL STUDY AND WORK

THE birth and life of a Branch of the Theosophical Society are very like to those of an individual. As with persons so with a body of theosophists engaged in theosophical endeavor and study, the parentage and the subsequent environment have much to do with the continuance of life and with the power of the influence exerted over the units which compose the association, as well as that which radiates from the Branch to others outside. And in a Theosophical Society its authorship is divided among all those who come together in order to start and carry it on. If the authors of its being are unintelligent, or confused, or uncertain, or self-seeking in the formation of the Society, its life and work will be the same. Growth will be stopped, influence hindered, and results—nothing. The work and influence of a Branch hinge upon the knowledge of theosophical doctrine, upon the motives, ideas, and ideals of the members, and so we have to consider what is the knowledge required and what should be the aims, ideas, and ideals of those who form and are to work in a Branch T.S. An inquiry should also be made into the methods which ought to be adopted as well as those that are to be avoided.

The work of a Branch has two objective points where it is intended, in the theosophical order of things, that its help and influence are to be felt. The first is in and among its members, and the other upon that portion of the world which lies within its purview. If, as I firmly believe, the theory of universal brotherhood is based upon a law—a fact—in nature that all men are spiritual beings who are indissolubly linked and united together in one vast whole, then no Branch, no individual theosophist, can be regarded as without significance and influence, nor is any member justified in supposing that he or she is too obscure, too unprogressed, to be of any benefit to the movement and thus to mankind at large.

The fact that a branch T.S. is a body of individuals makes stronger the certainty that by means of the subtle link which, under the law of unity, connects together all the men who are on this planet, a

---

NOTE.—This article by Mr. Judge was first published as No. 8 of the Branch Papers issued by the American Section of the Theosophical Society, and is dated November, 1890. It has been previously reprinted in THEOSOPHY.

wider and more potent influence for good or evil may be exerted through a Branch than through any single individual. For just as man is composed of atoms descended to him in various lines from many forefathers, all of which have a part in the influence he exerts, so a Branch is a being composed of the atoms—its members—included within its borders. And it is no fancy, no fantastic dream, to say that this being may be intelligent, or forceful, or weak, or wicked as a whole, just as it is made the one or the other by its component parts. And the declarations made by the adepts respecting individual theosophists should have weight with such a body. Those Beings have said that each member can aid the movement by explaining its fundamental doctrines or at least by doing away with misconceptions, and that no single unit in the whole should be as ignorant as to suppose that he or she has a special karma of his own unconnected with the rest. Not a single good example in theosophic life is lost, They say, but every one of us affects not only the immediate associates but also projects into the great universal current an influence that has its weight in the destiny of the race. Some of these golden words are as follows:

> Let not the fruit of good karma be your motive; for your karma, good or bad, being one and the common property of all mankind, nothing good or bad can happen to you that is not shared by many others. Hence, if the motive be for yourself it is selfish and can only generate a double effect—good and bad—and will either nullify your good actions or turn them to some other man's profit. There is no happiness for one who is ever thinking of self and forgetting other selves.

This is all applicable to a Branch in its totality, for it is an intelligent being quite as much under the government of karma as any individual. It will feel the karma of its actions, and the responsibility will rest upon the members who have neglected or obeyed the dictates of theosophic duty. And the karma of the entire international body will react upon it for benefit or the reverse, according to the good, bad, or indifferent karma which the Branch may have acquired by its course of action. It is a part of the whole, and no portion can be exempt from the influences belonging to the total mass of workers. Thus a Branch which has been indifferent, or selfish, or full of doubt or disloyalty regarding the ideals it promised to follow, will attract out of the international theosophic karma just enough to accentuate its weakness and doubt, and on the other hand a Branch which has worked hard, unselfishly, and earnestly

will attract the good from the whole sum of karma, and that, added to its own, will enable it to resist bad effects and will further strengthen the vital elements in its own corporate body.

The good or bad karma of the whole Theosophic Society may be figured as surrounding it from one end of the world to the other in the shape of layers and spheres of light or darkness. The light is good karma and the darkness is bad. Those units—Branches—which contain the elements of light within them will attract from the sphere of light as much of that as they are capable of holding, and the darkness will be drawn in by those which have darkness already. Thus we are all, theosophically speaking, keepers and helpers of each other, not only in the United States but in England, in Bombay, in Calcutta, in Madras. If we do not do our duty it may happen that some struggling Branch in some far off place will by reason of its newness or weakness be the recipient, not of help but of damage from us. Each Branch is separately responsible for its own actions, and yet every one is helped or injured by every other. These reciprocating influences work on the real though unseen plane where every man is dynamically united to every fellow man. And I am not uncharitable in saying that if the Indian Branches had worked more for the far-distant United States when it was unable to stand alone, we should now be the possessors of more in the way of elucidation and statistics and other aids from the far distant land than we can show. But even if the early-formed United States' Branches had worked with more zeal and energy toward the real ends of the Society, we should have been able earlier to materially aid and comfort our sincere brother and sacrificing worker, Col. H. S. Olcott. And now the newer Branches of the Society in this country have a better opportunity than others in the past, for all the fighting has been done and much work is ready to their hand.

So the most obscure has a place in the scheme as important as the one that is large and well known, while those that are lazy or doubting or selfish must compensate some time or another for their acts of commission, as well as for any failure to add to the general sum of good.

With this in view we may conclude that a single Branch has the power to efficiently aid and benefit not only its members but also the whole theosophic body corporate. This may be made clearer by remembering how often in the history of the world a family or even a man has sometimes been for the nation or race a power for the

greatest good or evil.

Under this doctrine of unity and selflessness the work of a Branch ought to be entered into by all the members with an unselfish spirit which will lead them to have patience with the weaker brethren, for a chain is no stronger than its weakest link, and therefore endeavor should be made to bring to the minds of the weakest the truths that the others see with less difficulty. And next, every individual, by eliminating the desire to get knowledge for himself, will thereby make the Branch as a whole open and porous to the unseen but real and powerful influences managed from behind the scenes by the great personages who have as a part of their work in the world the theosophic movement, and who are constantly at work among us for the purpose of aiding those who are sincere and unselfish. If the testimony of those who have been long in the Society is to be believed, then, as they assert, there are among us every day many disciples (who are known in our literature by the name of "Chelas") who are engaged in fanning the flame of spiritual illumination wherever they find it among the members. Their influence is not exerted because of wealth or personal prominence, but upon any one of any class who has tried to understand theosophy for the sake of others and in order that he may communicate to others in his turn. Not only has this been asserted by the leaders in the movement, but in the experience of many of us we have seen help extended to those who are in earnest for their fellow-man.

And this is peculiarly and more strongly applicable to those members who have as one of their aims the acquisition of psychic and abnormal powers. These powers cannot be safely found and used by the man who desires them for himself, and his mere statement in his heart or in words that he desires them for others goes for naught unless the deeper and inner motive and object coincide with the high one which is expressed. Our members, new and old, might as well become acquainted with the bald and naked truth on this subject now, as to wait for years of bitter experience to burn it into them. There are such powers and man may acquire them, but each age and each race has its limitations that it is not possible for the average man to overcome. Hardly any member who has desires for these would admit that he would be willing to become a black magician in order to acquire them, that is, would sacrifice his chances for emancipation for their sake. Yet without altruism one cannot get them except as a black magician. One has to deliberately make

up his mind that he will sacrifice everything and everybody else to his design if it is his intention to obtain them without following the rules laid down by the White Adepts inculcating truth, purity, charity, and all the virtues—in fact, altruism. There is no secret about the fact that two ways and no more lie open to the one who wishes for the powers of an adept, and those are on the right hand, that of virtue and altruism, and on the left—the black side—that of intense and unrelenting selfishness. No compromise, no mere dabbling, is allowed or possible, and more so in the selfish path, for there everyone's hand is against every other one; none will help in any crisis, and, when the hour arrives that the student in that school is in peril from the unseen and terrible forces of nature, his companions on the road will but sneer at his weakness and rejoice at his downfall. And, indeed, the line of demarcation between these two ways, for students of the grade of most of the members of our Society, is very thin. It is like the hair which the Mohammedan mystic says divides the false from the true. One has to be very careful so as to know if his motive is really so unselfish as he pretends it to himself to be. But it can always be tested by the reality of the feeling of brotherhood that he has in him. A mere intellectual longing to know and to discover further in this field is selfish and of the black variety, for unless every desire to know the truth is in order that one may give it to others, it is full of taint. Moreover, it will lead to no powers and to no real knowledge, for success on either side depends upon the burning of desire in the heart. With the white school this is for the sake of fellow-man, and on the dark hand the same fierce desire is for self alone.

Many persons, however, think that they can belong to the Society, and while negatively selfish, that is, ready and willing to sit down and hear others expound theosophical doctrine and never work for the body themselves, they may receive benefit in the way of comprehension of the doctrines of man and nature which are promulgated among us. But they forget a law in these matters of great importance, one, indeed, that they may not be willing to admit, and which is much opposed to our modern ideas of the powers and functions of the human mind. It is that such an attitude by reason of its selfishness builds up a hard wall between their minds and the very truths they wish to know. I speak of an actual dynamic effect which is as plain to the eye of the trained seer as is any object to the healthy eye.

We have been so accustomed for many years to vague ideas about the human mind, what it is, and what its powers really are, that people in general have no definite notion whether there be or not any material effect in the human economy from thoughts, or whether they are like what is usually called "imagination," a something very unreal and wholly without objectivity. But it is a fact that the mind of the selfish person is always making about itself a hard reflecting surface which throws off and away from its grasp the very knowledge the man himself would take if he but knew the reason why he fails.

This brings us naturally to the proposition that the aims of the members in a Branch should be to eradicate selfishness and to promulgate and illustrate the doctrine of universal brotherhood, basing the explanation upon the actual unity of all beings. This of itself will lead to the explanation of many other doctrines, as it underlies them all, great and small. And in order to do this the members ought to study the system as a whole, so that its parts may be comprehended. It is for the want of such study that we so often hear members, when asked to explain their theosophy, saying, "Well, to tell the truth, I know how it all is, but am not able to make it clear to you." They are not clear because they have not taken the time and trouble to learn the few fundamental propositions and how to apply them to any and every question.

A very common error is the supposition that new men, new enquirers, can be converted to theosophy and brought into its ranks by taking up and enforcing phenomena. In the term "phenomena" I include all such as spiritualism, clairvoyance, clairaudience, psychometry, hypnotism, mesmerism, thought-reading, and the like. These convert but few if any, because there is not much known about them and so many proofs are required before belief is induced. And even a belief in these things gives no sound basis of a theosophical character. A perfect illustration of this is seen in the history of H. P. Blavatsky, who for many years has permitted phenomena to occur with herself for the benefit of certain specific persons. These have been talked about by the whole world, and the Psychical Society saw fit to send a man to look into them after they had taken place, but although the very persons who saw them happen testified to their genuineness, they were denied by him and all laid to fraud and confederation. Everyone who was inclined from the first to believe in them continued to so believe, and those who never believed remained in the same state as before.

The best attested phenomena are ever subject to doubt so long as the philosophy on which they depend is not understood.

Furthermore, the mass of men and women in the world are not troubled about phenomena. These they think can be left alone for the present because more pressing things engage their attention and call for solution. The great problems of life: why we are here, why we suffer, and where may justice be found that will show the reason for the sufferings of the good man, or, indeed, for the sufferings of any one, press upon us. For each man thinks he is unjustly borne hard upon by fate when his cherished plans go for nothing, or his family is carried off by death, or his name is disgraced by a wayward child, or when, as is very often the case, he is unjustly accused and injured by his fellow-men. There are many who find themselves born poor when others less worthy are rich, and they ask why it is all thus and get no reply from the common religious systems of the day. It is life and its sorrows that destroy our peace, and every human heart wants to know the reason for it.

We must therefore offer theories that will give the answer, and these theories are the great doctrines of karma and reincarnation. These show justice triumphant in the world, meting out reward or punishment as it is deserved in any state of life. After an experience of fifteen years in the Society's work I have seen that more good and useful men and women have been attracted to our movement by these doctrines than have ever come to it by reason of phenomena, and that a great many have left our ranks who began on the phenomenal side. The members in general may not be aware of the fact that when the Society was formed the greater number of its New York members were spiritualists and that they nearly all left us long ago.

There is a mysterious power in these doctrines of karma and reincarnation which at last forces them upon the belief of those who take them up for study. It is due to the fact that the ego is itself the experiencer of rebirth and karma and has within a clear recollection of both, and rejoices, as it were, when it finds the lower mind taking them up for study. Each person is the concentration and result of karma, and is compelled from within to believe. The ethics of theosophy as enforced and illuminated by these twin doctrines should therefore be the object of our search and promulgation.

Furthermore, this course is authorized, for those who believe in the Adepts, by their words written about us. I quote:

> It is the insatiable craving for phenomena made so often degrading that has caused you so much trouble. Let the Society henceforth flourish upon its moral worth and the study of philosophy and ethics put into practice.

The next question is how to carry all this out in practice.

First, by having the Branch open to the public and never private.

Second, by regular attendance and meetings.

Third, by establishing a library, at first with the few important books, which few can be added to by the members from time to time through donations of books which they have read.

Fourth, by always having an article, original or otherwise, for reading and discussion. If literary talent is not available, its want can be supplied from the great quantity of articles which have come out in the Society's magazines during the last fifteen years. In those nearly every subject of theosophical interest has been written upon and explained. They can be looked up with very little labor, and used at each meeting. And they can be carried on upon settled lines so as to go over each subject fully. It will be found that nearly all the questions that now puzzle new members have been at one time or another illustrated and explained in these articles.

Fifth, by a careful elementary study of our doctrines from one or two books until the outline of all is grasped. Take, for instance, *Esoteric Buddhism.* This gives the system in the main, and many persons have read it, but a great many of these have done this but once. For them there often arise questions they might easily solve if they had made the system as a whole a part of their mental furniture. This book can be corrected by the *Secret Doctrine,* in which Mme. Blavatsky has said that *Esoteric Buddhism* is in the main correct, and she gives the means for supplying its deficiencies. Then there is that most useful book, *Five Years of Theosophy,* containing some of the most valuable articles that appeared in the *Theosophist.*

Sixth, by a method of discussion which does not permit any one person in the Branch to assert that his or her views are the correct ones. We cannot get at truth by assertion, but only by calm consideration of views advanced, and the self-asserting person is very nearly always close to error. I know this view is contrary to that of American independence, which leads us on forever to assert ourselves. The true philosophy annuls this and teaches that it is only from the concurrence of investigation that the truth can be arrived

at. And the deeper occultism says that the self-asserter debars himself from truth forever. No one mind has all the knowledge possible, and each one is naturally capable of seeing but the one side that is easy for him by reason of his race inheritance and the engrafted tendencies of his education.

Seventh, by remembering that we cannot at once alter the constitutional tendencies of the atoms of our brains, nor in a flash change ourselves. We are insensibly affected by our education, by the ideas of our youth, by the thought, whatever it was, that preceded our entrance upon theosophy. We require to have patience, not with the system of theosophy, but with ourselves, and be willing to wait for the gradual effect of the new ideas upon us.

The taking up of these ideas is, in effect, a new mental incarnation, and we, just as is the case of a new manvantara, have to evolve from the old estate and with care gradually eradicate the former bias. It is taught in the *Secret Doctrine* that the moon is the parent of the earth and has given to us all that we are now working over in our world. It is the same in the case under consideration. Our former mental state is our mental moon, and has given us certain material which we must work over, for otherwise we attempt to go contrary to a law of nature and will be defeated.

Some may ask if there is not any sort of study that will enable us to shave off these old erroneous modes of thought. To them I can only give the experience of many of my friends in the same direction. They say, and they are supported by the very highest authority, that the one process is to enquire into and attempt to understand the law of spiritual unity and the fact that no one is separate but that all are one in the plane of spirit, and that no single person has a particular spirit of his own, but the *atman,* called the "seventh principle," is, in fact, the synthesis of the whole and is the common property of every being high and low, human, animal, animate, inanimate, or divine. This is the teaching of the *Mundaka Upanishad* of the Hindus, and the meaning of the title "Mundaka" is "Shaving," because it shaves off the errors which stand in the way of truth, permitting then the brilliant lamp of spiritual knowledge to illuminate our inner nature.

And for those who desire to find the highest ethics and philosophy condensed in one book, I would recommend the *Bhagavad Gita,* studied with the aid of such lectures as those of our Hindu brother

—now deceased—Subba Row of Madras.[1] They have been reprinted from the *Theosophist* and can be procured by any one. In the *Secret Doctrine,* Mme. Blavatsky says: "The best metaphysical definition of primeval theogony in the spirit of the Vedantins may be found" in these lectures.

In the conclusion of *The Key to Theosophy,* H. P. Blavatsky, speaking of the future of the Theosophical Society writes:

> Its future will depend almost entirely upon the degree of selflessness, earnestness, devotion, and last but not least, upon the amount of knowledge and wisdom possessed by those members on whom it will fall to carry on the work and to direct the Society after the death of the Founders. If they cannot be free from the bias of theological education, the result can only be that the Society will drift off on to some sandbank of thought or another, and there remain a stranded carcass to moulder and die. But if that danger be averted the Society will live on into and through the twentieth century. It will burst asunder the iron fetters of creed and caste. The West will learn to understand and appreciate the East at its full value. The development of psychic powers will proceed healthily and normally, and mankind will be saved from terrible bodily and mental dangers which are inevitable where those powers develop in a hotbed of selfishness and passion as they now threaten to do.
>
> At the last quarter of every century one or more persons appear in the world as the agents of the Masters, and a greater or less amount of occult knowledge is given out.

She concludes by stating that the present T.S. is one of those attempts to help the world, and the duty of every member is made plain that they should preserve this body with its literature and original plans so as to hand it on to our successors who shall have it ready at the last quarter of the next century for the messenger of the Masters who will then, as now, reappear. Failure or success in this duty presents no obscure outcome. If we succeed, then in the twentieth century that messenger will find the materials in books, in thought, and in popular terms, to permit him or her to carry forward the great work to another stage without the fierce opposition and the tremendous obstacles which have frowned upon us during the fifteen years just closed. If we fail, then the messenger will waste again many precious years in repreparing the ground, and ours will be the responsibility.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

---

[1] *Theosophist* for February, March, and June, 1887.

letters • questions • comment

The more we consider the subject of Karma, the more it seems that instead of saying "good" and "bad" Karma, we should say desired and undesired Karma. Would this help in understanding a difficult subject?

In one sense, the words used do not matter—it is the idea conveyed that is important. Yet, these contrasting pairs of adjectives suggest certain changes of attitude. When Karma is termed good or bad, there may be an overtone of the idea of a God dispensing favors or punishments—an outside agent capable of intervening in our affairs. But if Karma is designated as either desired or undesired, the choice and will of the individual are seen as involved. To explore the matter further, we may note that the good is not always desired nor the bad undesired. Such is the complexity of man.

Any consideration of Karma should begin with an explanation of the term. A rather lengthy definition in the *Glossary* opens with the statement: "Physically, action; metaphysically, the LAW OF RETRIBUTION, the Law of cause and effect or Ethical Causation." This directs attention to the most significant aspect of Karma—that part over which we may exercise a measure of control. This is Karma as cause. Not only cause in the physical sense, but from the point of view of man as a moral being. The instinctive search by man for the root of moral causation is often noted. The physical cause of an event may be known—the car crashed because of a brake failure—but *why* was the driver killed? An earthquake toppled the buildings of the city—yet *why* were some saved while others lost their lives? The questioner seeks a *moral*, not a physical explanation in such cases.

From viewing Karma as result or effect we gradually begin to see that action may be traced beyond the physical event to the unseen cause. Thus, while we may speak of karmic results as being desired or undesired, it is evident that the causal aspect is also rooted in desire. As Mr. Judge says:

> It is necessary in order to understand the nature of Karma

> and its relation to the individual to consider action in all its aspects. Every act proceeds from the mind. Beyond the mind there is no action and therefore no Karma. The basis of every act is desire. The plane of desire or egotism is itself action and the matrix of every act. This plane may be considered as non-manifest, yet having a dual manifestation in what we call cause and effect, that is the act and its consequences. In reality, both the act and its consequences are the effect, the cause being on the plane of desire. Desire is therefore the basis of action in its first manifestation on the physical plane, and desire determines the continuation of the act in its Karmic relation to the individual. (THEOSOPHY 43:391.)

As this concept of the role of desire is considered, another question emerges. If an act is rooted in desire, why is the result often undesired? We want a certain object or condition, then find that we do not want what results. To be effective, an act must be governed by knowledge. It is often noted that an individual acting from a philanthropic basis may still cause harm or reap undesired Karma because he does not understand the true need of the situation. So an affirmative desire from the standpoint of cause may have a negative result. Within the limits of our present capabilities, all possible knowledge should illuminate a contemplated action. This means knowledge not only of physical laws and forces, but of metaphysical and ethical dynamics. It means knowledge in more than a hypothetical sense of the relationship of all beings in evolution, a relationship based on the unity which derives from a common source of all. Action from this basis would certainly tend in the direction of unselfish motivation, of desire for a wider range of good than merely personal gratification.

The Soul of man incarnates to gain experience. Such experience is the result of action, and action encompasses both cause and effect. To say that Karma is either desired or undesired is to acknowledge that while we know in principle that the Law exists, we often lack sufficient understanding of the details through which it manifests, and hence experience unwanted results. Yet the Perceiver learns from all experience. A lesson, pleasant or unpleasant, is still a lesson, and an unpleasant lesson, because it causes us to direct our minds to the act, may uncover hidden motives that we were unaware of.

It is well to remember, as Mr. Judge states, that "it must be through non-attachment that the soul will burst through the walls

of pain, it will only be through a change of mind that the Karmic burden will be lifted."

A statement with general bearing on this question occurs early in *The Secret Doctrine*:

> Parabrahm is not "God," because It is not *a* God. "It is that which is supreme, and not supreme (paravara)," explains Mandukya Upanishad (2.28). It is "Supreme" as CAUSE, *not supreme* as effect. (I,6.)

ROOM FOR GROWTH

There is no person, no group of people, no nation, that does not make grave mistakes. The test is: can they rectify their mistake? A man's honor becomes involved in how he meets this test; his sense of responsibility for the future of his children and the human race becomes involved. Honor and responsibility are a man's and a nations's greatest assets. They will carry us through any ordeal and, in the process, will enrich us and our civilization, no matter how painful the ordeal may be.

Our founding fathers understood that always there would be need for a nation to correct its old mistakes. And because they understood, they created a Constitution that was and still is a living, growing thing: resilient, flexible, sensitive to the fact that men change as they gain knowledge of their world and of themselves. Read it: you see within its pages so many open spaces left for growth. The people can do wrong, yes; we have in the past and will again; but our Constitution holds within it the potentials for doing right and the machinery for correcting our errors—and they will be corrected as soon as enough of us realize that change is needed.

—LILLIAN SMITH: *Now is the Time*

THE CHRISTIAN SCHEME

GNOSIS AND CHRISTIANITY: *The First Christians*

THE first groups of Christians, whom Renan shows numbering but from seven to twelve men in *each church,* belonged unquestionably to the poorest and most ignorant classes. They had and could have no idea of the highly philosophical doctrines of the Platonists and Gnostics, and evidently knew as little about their own newly-made-up religion. To these, who if Jews, had been crushed under the tyrannical dominion of the "law," as enforced by the elders of the synagogues, and if Pagans had been always excluded, as the lower castes are until now in India, from the religious mysteries, the God of the Jews and the "Father" preached by Jesus were all one. The contention which reigned from the first years following the death of Jesus, between the two parties, the Pauline and the Petrine—were deplorable. What one did, the other deemed a sacred duty to undo. If the *Homilies* are considered apocryphal, and cannot very well be accepted as an infallible standard by which to measure the animosity which raged between the two apostles, we have the Bible, and the proofs afforded therein are plentiful.

So hopelessly entangled seems Irenæus in his fruitless endeavors to describe, to all outward appearance at least, the true doctrines of the many Gnostic sects of which he treats and to present them at the same time as abominable "heresies," that he either deliberately, or through ignorance, confounds all of them in such a way that few metaphysicians would be able to disentangle them, without the *Kabala* and the *Codex* as the true keys. Thus, for instance, he cannot even tell the difference between the Sethianites and the Ophites, and tells us that they called the "God of all," *"Hominem,"* a MAN, and his mind the SECOND man, or the *"Son of man."* So does Theodoret, who lived more than two centuries after Irenæus, and who makes a sad mess of the chronological order in which the various sects succeed each other. Neither the Sethianites, (a branch of the Jewish Nazarenes) nor the Ophites, a purely Greek sect, have ever

---

NOTE.—"The Christian Scheme," begun in November, 1967, is collated from the works of H. P. Blavatsky. It recounts the historical background and early development of Christianity.

held anything of the kind. Irenæus contradicts his own words by describing in another place the doctrines of Cerinthus, the direct disciple of Simon Magus. He says that Cerinthus taught that the world was not created by the FIRST GOD, but by a virtue (virtus) or power, an Æon so distant from the First Cause that he was even ignorant of HIM who *is above all things*. This Æon subjected Jesus, he begot him physically through Joseph from one who was not a virgin, but simply the wife of that Joseph, and Jesus was born like all other men. Viewed from this physical aspect of his nature, Jesus was called the "son of man." It is only after his *baptism,* that *Christos,* the anointed, descended from the Princeliness of above, in the figure of a dove, and then announced the UNKNOWN Father through Jesus.

If, therefore, Jesus was physically considered as a son of man, and spiritually as the Christos, who overshadowed him, how then could the "GOD OF ALL," the *"Unknown* Father," be called by the Gnostics *Homo,* a MAN, and his Mind, Ennoia, the SECOND man, or *Son of man?* Neither in the Oriental *Kabala,* nor in Gnosticism, was the "God of all" ever anthropomorphized. It is but the first, or rather the second emanations, for Shekinah, Sephira, Depth, and other first-manifested female virtues are also emanations, that are termed "primitive men." Thus Adam Kadmon, Ennoia (or Sigè), the *logoi* in short, are the "only-begotten" ones but not the *Sons* of man, which appellation properly belongs to Christos the son of Sophia (the elder) and of the primitive man who produces him through his own vivifying light, which emanates from the source or *cause* of all, hence the *cause* of his light also, the "Unknown Father." There is a great difference made in the Gnostic metaphysics between the first unrevealed Logos and the "anointed," who is Christos. Ennoia may be termed, as Philo understands it, the *Second* God, but he alone is the "Primitive and First man," and by no means the Second one, as Theodoret and Irenæus have it. It is but the inveterate desire of the latter to connect Jesus in every possible way, even in the *Hæresies,* with the *Highest* God, that led him into so many falsifications.

Such an identification with the *Unknown* God, even of Christos, the anointed—the Æon who overshadowed him—let alone of the man Jesus, never entered the head of the Gnostics nor even of the direct apostles and of Paul, whatever later forgeries may have added.

How daring and desperate were many such deliberate falsifications was shown in the first attempts to compare the original manu-

scripts with later ones. In Bishop Horseley's edition of Sir Isaac Newton's works, several manuscripts on theological subjects were cautiously withheld from publication. The article known as *Christ's Descent into Hell,* which is found in the later Apostles' Creed, is not to be found in the manuscripts of either the fourth or sixth centuries. It was an evident interpolation copied from the fables of Bacchus and Hercules and enforced upon Christendom as an article of faith. Concerning it the author of the preface to the *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the King's Library* (preface, p. xxi.) remarks: "I wish that the insertion of the article of *Christ's Descent into Hell* into the Apostles' Creed could be as well accounted for as the *insertion* of the *said* verse" (First Epistle of John, v. 7).

Now, this verse reads: "For there are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one." This verse, which has been "appointed to be read in churches," is now known to be spurious. It is not to be found in any Greek manuscript, "save one at Berlin, which was transcribed from interpolated paraphrase between the lines. In the first and second editions of Erasmus, printed in 1516 and 1519, this allusion to these three heavenly witnesses is *omitted;* and the text is not contained in any Greek manuscript which was written earlier than the fifteenth century. It was not mentioned by either of the Greek ecclesiastical writers nor by the early Latin fathers, so anxious to get at every proof in support of their trinity; and it was omitted by Luther in his German version. Edward Gibbon was early in pointing out its spurious character. Archbishop Newcome rejected it, and the Bishop of Lincoln expresses his conviction that it is spurious. There are twenty-eight Greek authors—Irenæus, Clemens, and Athanasius included, who neither quote nor mention it; and seventeen Latin writers, numbering among them Augustine, Jerome, Ambrosius, Cyprian, and Pope Eusebius, who appear utterly ignorant of it. "It is evident that if the text of the heavenly witnesses had been known from the beginning of Christianity the ancients would have eagerly seized it, inserted it in their creeds, quoted it repeatedly against the heretics, and selected it for the brightest ornament of every book that they wrote upon the subject of the Trinity." Thus falls to the ground the strongest trinitarian pillar.

And now we ask again the question: Who were the first Christians? Those who were readily converted by the eloquent simplicity of Paul, who promised them, with the name of Jesus, *freedom* from

the narrow bonds of ecclesiasticism. They understood but one thing; they were the "children of promise" (Gal. 4:28). The "allegory" of the Mosaic Bible was unveiled to them; the covenant "from the Mount Sinai which gendereth *to bondage*" was Agar (Ibid., 24), the old Jewish synagogue, and she was "in bondage with her children" to Jerusalem, the new and the free, "the mother of us all." On the one hand the synagogue and the law which persecuted every one who dared to step across the narrow path of bigotry and dogmatism; on the other, Paganism[1] with its grand philosophical truths concealed from sight; unveiling itself but to the few, and leaving the masses hopelessly seeking to discover who was *the* god, among this overcrowded pantheon of deities and sub-deities. To others, the apostle of circumcision, supported by all his followers, was promising, if they obeyed the "law," a life hereafter, and a resurrection of which they had no previous idea. At the same time he never lost an occasion to contradict Paul without naming him, but indicating him so clearly that it is next to impossible to doubt whom Peter meant. While he may have converted some men, who whether they had believed in the Mosaic resurrection promised by the Pharisees, or had fallen into the nihilistic doctrines of the Sadducees, or had belonged to the polytheistic heathenism of the Pagan rabble, had no future after death, nothing but a mournful blank, we do not think that the work of contradiction, carried on so systematically by the two apostles, had helped much their work of proselytism. With the educated thinking classes they succeeded very little, as ecclesiastical history clearly shows. Where was the truth; where the inspired word of God? On the one hand, as we have seen, they heard the apostle Paul explaining that of the two convenants. "which things are an allegory," the old one from Mount Sinai, "which gendereth

---

[1] The term "Paganism" is properly used by modern writers with hesitation. Professor Alexander Wilder, in his edition of Payne Knight's *Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and Mythology*, says: "It ('Paganism') has degenerated into slang, and is generally employed with more or less of an opprobrious meaning. The correcter expression would have been 'the ancient ethnical worships,' but it would be hardly understood in its true sense, and we accordingly have adopted the term in popular use, but not disrespectfully. A religion which can develop a Plato, an Epictetus, and an Anaxagoras, is not gross, superficial, or totally unworthy of candid attention. Besides, many of the rites and doctrines in the Christian as well as in the Jewish Institute, appeared first in the other systems. Zoroastrianism anticipated far more than has been imagined. The cross, the priestly robes and symbols, the sacraments, the Sabbath, the festivals and anniversaries, are all anterior to the Christian era by thousands of years. The ancient worship, after it had been excluded from its former shrines, and from the metropolitan towns, was maintained for a long time by the inhabitants of humble localities. To this fact it owes its later designation. From being kept up in the *Pagi*, or rural districts, its votaries were denominated *Pagans*, or provincials."

unto bondage," was *Agar* the bondwoman; and Mount Sinai itself answered to "Jerusalem," which now is "in bondage" with her circumcised children; and the new covenant meant Jesus Christ—the "Jerusalem which is above and free"; and on the other Peter, who was contradicting and even abusing him. Paul vehemently exclaims, "Cast out the bondwoman and her son" (the old *law* and the synagogue). "The son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free; be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. . . . Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing!" (Gal.5:2). What do we find Peter writing? Whom does he mean by saying, "These who speak great swelling words of vanity. . . . While they promise them *liberty,* they themselves are servants of corruption, for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage. . . . For if *they have escaped* the pollution of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour, they are again entangled therein, and overcome . . . it had *been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness,* than after they have known it to turn from the holy *commandment delivered unto them"* (Second Epistle).

Peter certainly cannot have meant the Gnostics, for they had never seen "the holy commandment delivered unto them"; Paul had. They never promised any one "liberty" from bondage, but Paul had done so repeatedly. Moreover the latter rejects the "old covenant," Agar the bondwoman; and Peter holds fast to it. Paul warns the people against the *powers* and *dignities* (the lower angels of the kabalists); and Peter, as will be shown further, respects them and *denounces those who do not.* Peter preaches circumcision and Paul forbids it.

Later, when all these extraordinary blunders, contradictions, dissensions and inventions were forcibly crammed into a frame elaborately executed by the episcopal caste of the new religion, and called Christianity; and the chaotic picture itself cunningly preserved from too close scrutiny by a whole array of formidable Church penances and anathemas, which kept the curious back under the false pretense of sacrilege and profanation of divine mysteries; and millions of people had been butchered in the name of the God of mercy—then came the Reformation. It certainly deserves its name in its fullest parodoxical sense. It abandoned Peter and alleges to have chosen Paul for its only leader. And the apostle who thundered against the

old law of bondage; who left full liberty to Christians to either observe the Sabbath or set it aside; who rejects everything anterior to John the Baptist, is now the professed standard-bearer of Protestantism, which holds to the *old* law more than the Jews, imprisons those who view the Sabbath as Jesus and Paul did, and outvies the synagogue of the first century in dogmatic intolerance!

But who then *were* the first Christians, may still be asked? Doubtless the Ebionites; and in this we follow the authority of the best critics. "There can be little doubt that the author (of the *Clementine Homilies*) was a representative of Ebionitic Gnosticism, which *had once been the purest of primitive Christianity. . . .*" And who were the Ebionites? The pupils and followers of the early Nazarenes, the kabalistic Gnostics. In the preface to the *Codex Nazaræus,* the translator says: "That also the Nazarenes did not reject . . . the Æons is natural. For of the Ebionites who acknowledged them (the Æons), these were the instructors."

We find, moreover, Epiphanius, the Christian Homer of *The Heresies,* telling us that "Ebion had the opinion of the Nazarenes, the form of the Cerinthians (who fable that the world was put together by angels), and the appellation of Christians." An appellation certainly more correctly applied to them than to the orthodox (so-called) Christians of the school of Irenæus and the later Vatican. Renan shows the Ebionites numbering among their sect all the surviving relatives of Jesus. John the Baptist, his cousin and *precursor,* was the accepted Saviour of the Nazarenes, and their prophet. His disciples dwelt on the other side of the Jordan, and the scene of the baptism of the Jordan is clearly and beyond any question proved by the author of *Sod, the Son of the Man,* to have been the site of the Adonis-worship. "Over the Jordan and beyond the lake dwelt the Nazarenes, a sect said to have existed already at the birth of Jesus, and to have counted him among its number. They must have extended along the east of the Jordan, and southeasterly among the Arabians (Gal. 1:17, 21; 2:11), and Sabæans in the direction of Bosra; and again, they must have gone far north over the Lebanon to Antioch, also to the northeast to the Nazarian settlement in Berœa, where St. Jerome found them. In the desert the Mysteries of Adonis may have still prevailed; in the mountains Aiai Adonai was still a cry."

"Having been united (conjunctus) to the Nazarenes, each (Ebionite) imparted to the other out of his own wickedness, and

decided that Christ *was the seed of a man,"* writes Epiphanius.

And if they did, we must suppose they knew more about their contemporary prophet than Epiphanius 400 years later. Theodoret, as shown elsewhere, describes the Nazarenes as Jews who "honor the Anointed as a just man," and use the *evangel* called *"According to Peter."* Jerome finds the authentic and original *evangel,* written in Hebrew, by Matthew the apostle-publican, in the library collected at Cæsarea, by the martyr Pamphilius. *"I received permission from the Nazaræans,* who at Berœa of Syria used this (gospel) to translate it," he writes toward the end of the fourth century.[2] "In the *evangel* which the *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites* use," adds Jerome, "which recently I translated from Hebrew into Greek,[3] and which is called by most persons the *genuine Gospel of Matthew,"* etc.

That the apostles had received a "secret doctrine" from Jesus, and that he himself taught one, is evident from the following words of Jerome, who confessed it in an unguarded moment. Writing to the Bishops Chromatius and Heliodorus, he complains that "a difficult work is enjoined, since this translation has been commanded me by your Felicities, which *St. Matthew himself, the Apostle and Evangelist,* DID NOT WISH TO BE OPENLY WRITTEN. For if it had not been SECRET, he (Matthew) would have added to the *evangel* that which he gave forth was his; but he made up this book sealed up in the Hebrew characters, which he put forth *even in such a way* that the book, written in Hebrew letters and *by the hand of himself,* might be possessed *by the men most religious,* who also, in the course of time, received it from those who preceded them. But this very book they never gave to any one to be transcribed, and its *text* they related some one way and some another." And he adds further on the same page: "And it happened that this book, having been published by a disciple of Manichæus, named Seleucus, who also wrote falsely The Acts of the Apostles, exhibited matter not for edification, but for destruction; and that this book was approved in a synod which the ears of the Church properly refused to listen to."[4]

---

[2] Hieronymus: *De Virus.*, illust., cap. 3. "It is remarkable that, while all church fathers say that Matthew wrote in *Hebrew*, the whole of them use the Greek text as the genuine apostolic writing, without mentioning what relation the *Hebrew* Matthew has to our Greek one! It had many *peculiar additions* which are wanting in our evangel."

[3] Jerome adds that it was written in the Chaldaic language, but with Hebrew letters.

[4] This accounts also for the rejection of the works of Justin Martyr, who used only this "Gospel according to the Hebrews," as also did most probably Titian, his disciple. At what late period was fully established the *divinity* of Christ we can judge by the mere fact that even in the fourth century Eusebius did not denounce this book as spurious,

He admits, himself, that the book which he authenticates as being written *"by the hand of Matthew";* a book which, notwithstanding that he translated it twice, was nearly unintelligible to him, for it was arcane or *a secret.* Nevertheless, Jerome coolly sets down every commentary upon it, except his own, as *heretical.* More than that, Jerome knew that this *original* Gospel of Matthew was the expounder of the only true doctrine of Christ; and that it was the work of an evangelist who had been the friend and companion of Jesus. He knew that if of the two Gospels, the Hebrew in question and the Greek belonging to our present Scripture, one was spurious, hence heretical, it was not that of the Nazarenes; and yet, knowing all this, Jerome becomes more zealous than ever in his persecutions of the "Hæretics." Why? Because to accept it was equivalent to reading the death-sentence of the established Church. The Gospel according to the Hebrews was but too well known to have been the only one accepted for four centuries by the Jewish Christians, the Nazarenes and the Ebionites. And neither of the latter accepted the *divinity* of Christ.

If the commentaries of Jerome on the Prophets, his famous *Vulgate,* and numerous polemical treatises are all as trustworthy as this version of the Gospel according to Matthew, then we have a divine revelation indeed.

Why wonder at the unfathomable mysteries of the Christian religion, since it is perfectly *human?* Have we not a letter written by one of the most respected Fathers of the Church to this same Jerome, which shows better than whole volumes their traditionary policy? This is what *Saint* Gregory of Nazianzen wrote to his friend and confidant *Saint* Jerome: "Nothing can impose better on a people than *verbiage;* the less they understand the more they admire. Our fathers and doctors have often said, not what they thought, but what circumstances and necessity forced them to."

---

but only classed it with such as the Apocalypse of John; and Credner shows Nicephorus inserting it, together with the Revelation, in his "Stichometry," among the Antilegomena. The Ebionites, the *genuine* primitive Christians, rejecting the rest of the apostolic writings, made use only of this Gospel, and the Ebionites, as Epiphanius declares, firmly believed, with the Nazarenes, that Jesus was but a man "of the seed of a man."

on the lookout

Another Assassination

The shooting, on June 5, and the death soon after, of Senator Robert F. Kennedy brought renewed shock to a nation hardly recovered from the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The tragic event in Los Angeles also revived painful memories of the killing in 1963 of President John F. Kennedy, Robert's older brother. While there may be theories as to the particular motives behind these terrible happenings, most of such attempts at explanation pale before common agreement that the habitual violence of the age, often with legal sanction, is the underlying cause. When violence is increasingly a policy pursued by all nations, including our own, and reports of the killings in war are commonplaces of news, it becomes increasingly difficult to control individual excesses. The idea of violence grows into an obsessive presence, infecting the minds of weak or suggestible persons, and there is little in the example of the times to provide restraint. Needless to say, there could hardly be more forceful demonstration of the need for knowledge of Karma, or clearer illustration of the disorders which overtake a civilization heedless of retributive justice. It may be hoped that the horror of these assassinations will move men to reflect more deeply concerning the workings of moral law.

The Secret Doctrine

By now, it will be generally known that the man arrested and charged with shooting Robert Kennedy, Sirhan Bishara Sirhan, is a twenty-four-year-old Jordanian who has been in the United States since he was twelve. It was reported that Sirhan believed this country's help to Israel in its conflict with the Arab nations, a policy supported by Mr. Kennedy, to be wrong and unjust. But this is only background. Wondering about the motives behind the attack was

complicated by the fact that, on the evening of June 6, radio news commentators announced that Sirhan had requested a copy of H. P. Blavatsky's *The Secret Doctrine,* and also *Talks on At the Feet of the Master,* by C. W. Leadbeater. (The latter book is a commentary on a volume by Jiddu Krishnamurti.) There was a flurry of excitement when a reporter said that Sirhan had asked for a "handbook of revolution," attributing it to Madame Blavatsky, or suggesting this as content of *The Secret Doctrine,* but this wild misinformation was discredited as the more responsible media gave reasonably accurate accounts of what is to be found in H.P.B.'s major work. Sirhan is said to belong to a Christian denomination, and his interest in *The Secret Doctrine* may be explained by the wide-ranging reading habits of many of the young. However, there is also the possibility that Sirhan's concern with Theosophical books comes from antagonism toward Theosophy or a misconception of it; at any rate, talk of a charge that Theosophy teaches "self-hypnosis" indicates complete ignorance of H.P.B.'s uncompromising opposition to hypnotic practices. If, more conventionally, the unfortunate young man had asked for a New Testament, there would have been little news-value in the request. But his asking for a little-known Theosophical book attracted wide attention, causing brief speculation as to the "significance" of this interest. However, since publication of such sober reports of the incident as appeared in the *New York Times* (June 7), no special importance is any longer attached to Sirhan's choice of books.

The Non-Violence of H. P. Blavatsky

People who remain generally curious are easily informed of Madame Blavatsky's unconcern with politics, of her hope and admiration for peaceful, bloodless reform—she speaks in two places especially of the fact that Gautama Buddha's mission never led to war or violence, but to the practice of harmlessness—and of her rejection of the "insane dreams" of revolutionary political extremists. She explicitly wrote that Theosophical Teachers could have nothing to do with uprisings involving the regicide violence of the French Revolution and she characterized the popular "law" of the struggle for life or "self-preservation" as amounting to "mutual homicide," leading men to "a retrograde reinvolution into the animal kingdom." So there is no way in which the violence of the act charged against Sirhan can be connected with Madame Blavatsky's

writings. She showed a deep compassion for the deprived and downtrodden of the earth, but there is no trace of encouragement to angry retaliation. H. P. Blavatsky was a follower of the teachings of the gentle Buddha, and she worked to put an end to the violence among men.

Blind Piety

While admitting that "men of the West have often been more Christian in name than Christian in deed in dealing with the non-Christian world," an editorial in the *Christian Science Monitor* for last March 8 declares that "virtually all that Africa and Asia are seeking today has its roots in Christian fundamentals and in what these latter have brought to the world." And while it is confessed that the "crisis of Christianity" on those vast continents is owed to the unChristian behavior of Christian colonizers, the editorial nonetheless asserts that it is the elements of Christianity "which permitted the Western world to make unparalleled progress," and which should now be made to serve other regions, without "national, racial, or political boundaries."

There is no question but that the ethics shared by Jesus with other great teachers could, if applied, raise the level of social life not only in Africa and Asia, but all over the world, but it seems doubtful, today, that any of the peoples of continents so long exploited by the Western nations will be inclined to accept instruction from nominal Christians. On the contrary, students of Theosophy, recalling prophecies by H. P. Blavatsky, have a different expectation: "The twentieth century has strange developments in store for humanity, and may even be the last of its name."

"Never to Resurrect"

Writing in "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels," H.P.B. said:

> Belief in the Bible *literally*, and in a *carnalized* Christ, will not last a quarter of a century longer. The Churches will have to part with their cherished dogmas, or the 20th Century will witness the downfall and ruin of all Christendom, and with it, belief even in a Christos, as pure spirit. The very name has now become obnoxious, and theological Christianity must die out, *never to resurrect again* in its present form. This, in itself, would be the happiest solution of all, were there no danger from the natural reaction which is sure to follow: crass materialism will be the consequence and the result of centuries of blind faith, unless the

> loss of old ideals is replaced by other ideals, unassailable, because *universal,* and built on the rock of eternal truths, instead of the shifting sands of human fancy. Pure immateriality must replace, in the end, the terrible anthropomorphism of those ideals in the conceptions of our modern dogmatists.

Well, we now have the "God is dead" theology to confirm a part of this prophecy; we have also experienced the brutal effects of the materialistic reaction; and we still await, in the world at large, the replacement of old beliefs by other, unassailable ideals. The present is a time of contest and struggle, although, beneath the surface, also a time of search and wondering.

The Nature of Human Nature

The wondering is as common in the world of science as it is in the field of religious thought. A social scientist, Ralph T. Templin, editor of the *Journal of Human Relations,* says in the issue for the first quarter of this year:

> Much that now prevails of the Western thought and behavior can only be described as Modern Man's flight from his own Spirit. Social Scientists who, like Robert Ardrey of *African Genesis* and *The Territorial Imperative,* try to find the nature of human nature only in Man's animal origins, cater to and lead Man in his Modern escapism from the reality of his place and responsibility in Nature. Whatever transpired in evolution to bring man to his humanness and distinct from the animalness of nature and over whatever period, the point or space of change is marked by the human Spirit's assertion of control, both for better and worse, over the "Self" of human Nature and ultimately over all Nature and all else in the world.

Man Essentially Spirit

A fundamental humanism, no more subservient to science than to theology, finds expression through Mr. Templin:

> Man is after all "nature's do all, well or ill." His flight from his nature of human nature is precisely in that he "sprawls," just as it is in that he "wars," right up to his ultimate of nuclear holocaust. He is in control, but not in control; and this represents his *vast alienation from his own self—from the spirit which is his humanness.*
>
> Man is essentially "spirit" in control of creation as rightly understood. This ascendency of the superorganic over the organic and inorganic transpired over eons during which man's face was "turned from the clod." And after all evolution, even with man's marvelous complexity, reassertions of "raw nature," still just as "red in tooth and claw," may seem to confirm the notion of the

dominance of animal origins. Nevertheless, man is "spirit in control," if at all understood.

> There is a strange paradox of Man's modernness: as science discloses more of the essential humanness in cultural evolutionary community building, modern man asserts less and less of this essential nature as revealed; or rather he seems to war against his own humanness.

The Cry of Protest

There seems here a clear apprehension of the titanic moral struggle going in the human breast—a struggle prophetically portrayed by Victor Hugo in his poem about Lucifer, to which H.P.B. refers in "The Fall of Ideals." "Hugo's Lucifer," she says, "fights a fearful battle with his own terrible passions and again becomes an angel of light, after the awfullest agonies ever conceived by mortal mind and recorded by human pen." To illustrate this agony in the present, one has only to read Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth* —a brilliant articulation of the longings of peoples who have been victims for centuries, and who are now arising and seeking a humanism of their own definition, since what they have suffered may have made it impossible to recognize any other. There is again prophecy in the closing words of "The Fall of Ideals":

> This white lotus of thought springs now, as in former ages, from the rottenness of the world of matter, generating *Protest* and LIBERTY. It is springing in our very midst and under our very eyes, from the mire of modern civilization, fecund bed of contrasting virtues. In this foul soil sprouted the germs which ultimately developed into All-denying protestators, Atheists, Nihilists, and Anarchists, men of the Terror. Bad, violent, criminal some of them may be, yet no one of them could stand as the copy of Satan; but taking this heart-broken, hopeless, embittered portion of humanity in their collectivity, they are just Satan himself; for he is the ideal synthesis of all discordant forces and each separate human vice or passion is but an atom of his totality. In the very depths of the heart of this HUMAN Satanic totality burns the divine spark, all negations notwithstanding. It is called LOVE FOR HUMANITY, an ardent aspiration for a universal reign of Justice—hence a latent desire for light, harmony and goodness. Where do we find such a divine spark among the proud and the wealthy? In respectable society and the correct orthodox, so-called religious portion of the public, one finds but a predominating feeling of selfishness and a desire for wealth at the expense of the weak and the destitute, hence as a parallel, indifference to injustice and evil. Before Satan, the incarnate PROTEST, repents and unites with his fellow man in one common

Brotherhood, all cause for protest must have disappeared from earth. And that can come to pass only when Greed, Bias, and Prejudice shall have disappeared before the elements of Altruism and Justice to all.

The Health of Mankind

At about the time that Fanon was giving voice to the deprived and depressed men of Africa, Danilo Dolci, the Italian Gandhi, was formulating an introduction to his book, *A New World in the Making* (Monthly Review Press, 1965), in which he said:

> One of the fundamental questions to which we must try to find an answer can, I believe, be expressed in these terms. Man has lost his belief in the existence of a ready-made system of moral truth, yet how is he to be sure that his attempt to renew his being will lead him to other, more exact notions? What means has he of discovering his true, essential function, the fundamental lines of approach to his true purpose—to live a full, and natural life? . . . Certain moral principles the "new" man cannot but adopt. He must admit for example that life belongs to everyone; and that everyone has the right to live it in the fullest possible sense; that you cannot cure evils if you do not understand them; that each man has a point of view; that mankind will only be healthy when it realizes the essential need for unity.
>
> I do not believe it will be long now before mankind has taken these principles for granted; and not only in the general terms in which I have set them down. . . . The individual must be reawakened, as it were, to the value of his life, which must become the focal center of responsibility.

"Why Are We Here?"

Dolci is the reformer who aroused all the world to his aid when he was tried for an illegal demonstration to obtain employment for the starving workmen of Sicily. He is the man who explained his attitude toward religion in the following dialogue, taken from *Fire Beneath the Ashes,* by James McNeish:

> "I didn't leave the Church only because it was uncharitable. But because it was actually a *subversive* element, not only in Trappeto, but in the whole zone. What was it that upset me most? After the war throughout that whole rising of the poor, when the people turned 'outlaws' in order to live—I realized that the priests could have stopped this, they could have *tried* to stop it. But not one priest stepped in to help the people, to stop the police, to stop the firings, to stop the tortures. Not one."
>
> "You don't use the word God any more."

"When I understood that the word 'God' was likely to bring more confusion than clarity—we talk to be clear, don't we?—then I stopped using it. I don't believe in a personal God, not in the old traditional sense, any more. For me the key is *creativity*. 'To create'—how do we create? . . . . What matters is that man should be creative. There's nothing higher in man. But is this religious? Some say it is. . . . Look: and in this sense it seems I am religious—for me the *Why?* of everything remains the *Why?* Why are we here? This is something that modern culture largely ignores or eliminates. And I think it's wrong."

Here, Dolci seems to share in the view with which H.P.B. ended her article, "The Fall of Ideals." The utopian condition of universal justice, putting an end to protest, cannot come about, she said, until the dominant theology of the time—"the Dead-sea fruit of Spirituality," she called it—"shall have disappeared."

Ancient Stone Carvings

The pictorial rocks of Arizona have long captured the interest of travelers. In 1964, the late William Coxon, of Phoenix, wrote about "Ancient Manuscripts on American Stone" (see Lookout for July, 1965), and proposed that these carvings were not "doodlings" but maps. He came to the conclusion that the term "petroglyphs" did not adequately classify them, and suggested the name "Cognate Geometric Rock-writings."

Now, according to the *Arizona Republic* (Phoenix, Feb. 11), Mr. LaVan Martineau asserts he has "cracked the code" of the petroglyphs. Mr. Martineau agrees with Mr. Coxon that the pictures are not doodlings, for many obviously old petroglyphs have been altered —the additions showing sharp and clean as contrasted with the older signs which are weathered by the patina called "desert varnish." "Why," asks Mr. Martineau, "would anybody want to edit a doodle?"

Basic Ingredients of Petroglyphic Language

The account continues:

Central to Martineau's theory is that the choice of the rock itself influences the meaning of a petroglyph. If a series of dots indicates a map of a trail, then dots crossing a crack in the rock means even more: the trail crosses a canyon.

Another aspect of picture writing is the disproportionate number of goat-like symbols. Wherever petroglyphs are found, very likely the patterns will include goat pictures that "bear little

> resemblance to any native game animals." And odd goats they are. Some have one horn. Some two. Some three. The horns go in all directions. Goats may have any number of legs. Abstractions of goats are numerous and grotesque.

This goat symbol, which is always predominant, offered the "early clues to deciphering the language," says Mr. Martineau. He asserts he can now read about half of the petroglyphic language.

H. P. Blavatsky shows in *The Secret Doctrine* that goat symbolism is very ancient, very occult. A symbol of such power would undoubtedly be retained even after knowledge of its true meaning had been lost. The recurrence of this figure on the picture rocks of Arizona may, therefore, be a clue to their antiquity—a reminder that Atlanteans may have used this trail to migrate overland into Central America, as told in the old Aztec legend. (See Lookout cited above.)

Another "Story" in Stone

A trick of light and shade enabled a minerologist, Mr. Michael Terry, to see a previously undiscovered face carved in the rocks of a cave in central Australia. (The *Australian,* Feb. 8.) After writing to several people without eliciting replies, Mr. Terry finally reported his find to the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. The Institute responded by sending a party headed by Mr. Robert Edwards, curator of the South Australian Museum, to meet Mr. Terry, who led them to the site. Mr. Edwards said the carvings were thousands of years old and were not made by known Aboriginals. "No one," he added, "really knows when the Aboriginals arrived in Australia. It might have been more than 20,000 years ago. Neither do we know how or why they spread into different tribes."

Other researches in central Australia have resulted in unearthing fossils on an Aboriginal reserve in the same general locality as Mr. Terry's find. These fossils are at least 30 million years old, and include parts of the head of a giant ground-bird, teeth of lung fish and crocodiles and parts of turtles. This again shows the antiquity of Australia, which, H.P.B. says, "is one of the oldest lands now above the waters."